

To: "Robert Law" [rlaw@demaximis.com]
Cc: []
Bcc: []
From: CN=Stephanie Vaughn/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Tue 8/28/2012 6:31:42 PM
Subject: Re: Some questions.....

Hi Rob -- a couple of old, and some new questions....

1. following up on the caged bivalve validated data question, below, Sharon did not receive a CD. We suspect the data on Sharepoint may be validated, but mis-labelled as unvalidated. Could you either check into this, or just have the validated data sent/uploaded?
2. I may have mentioned this already, but we still have not received Appendix I from the RM 10.9 Characterization Report. This is the Sedimentology Review. Please let me know the status.
3. Could you please send 4 of the glass-wool fiber pre-filters that are now proposed for use on the HV CWCM program? Please either send pre-cleaned filters, or the uncleaned filters along with the SOP your lab will be using to clean them.
4. Finally, are you still planning to submit a background sampling QAPP....soon?

Thanks,
Stephanie

From: "Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com>
To: Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Willard Potter" <otto@demaximis.com>, "Mike Barbara" <mab.consulting@verizon.net>
Date: 08/07/2012 05:36 PM
Subject: Re: Some questions.....

1. We won't have all comments addressed until next week the lag is with the lab's revising SOPS. Possibly the week of August 20
2. EPA will be provided the data in mass/sample and concentration
3. The data is on a CD and we will send that to Sharon. I made the assumption that when I released the reports for uploading to the portal that included sending the data CDS as well. As a bonus, we will send the Forage Fish data CD as well.
4. Yes we can
5. In will be late August based on Roger's vacation schedule

Tierra Sedflume Data Proposal

Based on our conversation this morning about Tierra's plan to conduct a pilot of Han's sediment data collection as a possible substitute for SEDFLUME data collection. The CPG is the party responsible for developing the model for LPR and Newark Bay as such it should have a part in determining whether this

pilot that Tierra and Eugenia are considering is practical and will provide any meaningful and useful result for the development of the NBSA STM.

Tierra and its consultants have made it clear that they do not like sedflume data, but it is not within their purview to suggest alternative data collection methods. Sedflume data is the standard input for SEDZLJ which EPA has mandated that the CPG use in its development of the LPR/NB Model. Moreover, my understanding of the new EPA guidance on Sediment transport model requires the use of SEDZLJ and sedflume data (Eugenia's statement to me). The CPG is concerned that NBSA team may heading off on science experiment that is inconsistent with current EPA guidance and the LPRSA AOC which could delay the completion of the LPR/NB Model, because the actual data required are sedflume data. There were reasons that the CPG did not pursue Hans' methodology. They include that it was unproven and had only been used at a few sites. It is not directly compatible with sedflume data and therefore can not simply replace sedflume data in SEDZLJ.

The LPR/NB model requires sedflume data; it was EPA's decision to use SEDZLJ. Moreover, the CPG has a legal responsibility to complete the LPR/NB Model and no decision about data collection for the model should be made without the full participation and consultation of the CPG. Tierra's obligation under the NBSA AOC is to collect data to support the SEDZLJ model that EPA has mandated and as such collecting the required data should be the primary focus of the NBSA team's effort.

Thanks

R/
Rob

Robert Law, Ph.D.
de maximis, inc.
rlaw@demaximis.com
Voice: 908-735-9315

Fax: 908-735-2132>>> Stephanie Vaughn <Vaughn.Stephanie@epamail.epa.gov> 8/7/2012 2:57 PM >>>
Hi Rob,

Just had a general planning call and a few unrelated questions came up:

1. Any idea when you think you'll be submitting the revised HV CWCM QAPP, and when are you thinking you'll be able to get out in the field? We need to coordinate our oversight planning.
2. Again for the HV CWCM program, we are going to need to review the raw results, in mass/sample, as well as the procedure you use to convert these results to a concentration. Just an FYI.
3. Is the caged bivalve data on SharePoint final? It does not appear to be from the title, but the report references it. Please clarify.
4. We still have some questions about how you handled the percent detect calculations for the low-volume CWCM data. Could we set up a call to discuss?
5. Could you send a full, revised schedule?

Thanks,
Stephanie